DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 419 395 FL 025 235

AUTHOR Hornberger, Nancy H.
TITLE Language Policy and Ideological Paradox: A Comparative Look at Bilingual Intercultural Education Policy and Practice in Three Andean Countries.
PUB DATE 1998-03-00
NOTE 46p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Association for Applied Linguistics (20th, Seattle, WA, March 1998).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Bilingual Education; Change Strategies; *Cultural Pluralism; Educational Change; *Educational Policy; Essays; Foreign Countries; Indigenous Populations; *Language Planning; *Multicultural Education; Personal Narratives; *Public Policy; Rural Areas; Uncommonly Taught Languages; Urban Areas
IDENTIFIERS Bolivia; Ecuador; Peru

ABSTRACT

Recent developments in language policy and educational reform in Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia have opened new possibilities for indigenous languages and their speakers through bilingual intercultural education. Use of the term "intercultural" is examined in official policy documents and in short narratives about intercultural practice by indigenous and non-indigenous educators. Focus is on the paradox inherent in transforming a standardized education into a diversifying one, and constructing a national identity that is multilingual and multicultural. The discussion begins with a brief review of literature on language ideologies, multilingualism, and speech communities and of the sociolinguistic context of these three countries. It proceeds to an analysis of the "intercultural" emphasis in the countries' policies on bilingual intercultural education. Fifty-seven narratives of students in two course on bilingual education and language planning, taught by the author in Peru and Bolivia, are then examined. The narratives were one-page essays depicting an instance of intercultural interaction in an educational setting, focusing on urban-rural issues, student perceptions of cultural identity and interaction, role of cultural characteristics and sociocultural patterns, and their implications for development of a new educational ideology in the three countries. Contains 55 references. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 419 395

Language policy and ideological paradox:
A comparative look at bilingual intercultural education policy and practice in three Andean countries.

by Nancy H. Hornberger

University of Pennsylvania

Paper to be presented at the American Association for Applied Linguistics

in Seattle, Washington, March 1998

Invited Colloquium

Countries in Transition: Implications for Language Policy

FL025235

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

✓ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

Nancy H. Hornberger

Abstract

Recent developments in language policy and education reform in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia have opened up new possibilities for indigenous languages and their speakers through bilingual intercultural education. Examining the use of the term 'intercultural' in policy documents and short practitioner narratives, this paper explores the paradox inherent in transforming a standardizing education into a diversifying one, and constructing a national identity which is also multilingual and multicultural.

Language policy and ideological paradox:
A comparative look at bilingual intercultural education policy and practice in three Andean countries.

Indigenous languages in Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia have in the last quarter of the 20th century experienced a reversal of their legal fortunes, after centuries of official prohibition and social denigration dating from the imposition of colonial rule by the Spaniards in the 16th century. Beginning with the 1975 Officialization of Quechua in Peru, developments in language policy and education reform in all three countries have opened up new worlds of possibility for the oppressed indigenous languages and their speakers, principally through the vehicle of bilingual intercultural education. Yet, to introduce the use of the indigenous languages into formal education in these contexts produces paradox - a fundamentally ideological paradox about roles and possibilities for multiple languages and their speakers within one national society. Specifically, there are tensions and contradictions inherent in transforming what has been and continues to be a tool for standardization and national unification into, simultaneously, a vehicle for diversification and emancipation. This paper explores this paradox by examining the use and meanings of the term 'intercultural' in two kinds of texts relating to bilingual intercultural education: 1) official policy documents and 2) short narratives about intercultural practice by indigenous and non-indigenous educational professionals.*

Scholars have recently drawn our attention to the value of investigating relationships among language structure, language use, and political economy (Gal 1989:346), to the significance of language ideologies as mediating links in those relationships (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994:55), and to the usefulness of discourse analysis as a way of uncovering those relationships and links (Pennycook 1994). Language is multifunctional, they argue, and as

such fulfills not only denotational roles, but also indexical and constitutive roles with respect to social structure (Gal 1989:347). While recognizing the ground-breaking contributions of sociolinguistics in moving the analysis of language beyond a focus on language structure to one on language use in social context, these authors note that there is a need to move still further, toward locating linguistic practices as parts of larger systems of social inequality (Gal 1989: 347).

Without such an emphasis, they point out, important areas remain unexplored. A case in point is the relationships between bilingualism and gender inequities. For example, in a review of sociolinguistic research in Latin America as it relates to the question of gender, Freeland (1998) finds three main strands of work, none of which takes gendered language into account: variationist studies of language change, focusing on monolingual Spanish or Portuguese speakers; anthropological linguistic studies focusing on monolingual speakers of indigenous languages; and studies in bilingualism, bilingual education, and language planning, focusing on the relationship between mainstream and minority languages. Reviewing work on bilingualism and literacy in Britain, Martin-Jones (forthcoming) finds a similar gap of attention to gender inequities. In both cases, the few studies that do take up these relationships are exceptions that merely prove the rule; and in both cases, these studies reveal that "linguistic codes in [bilingual communities] are symbolically constructed in ways which articulate and reinforce gender/power structures" (Freeland 1998). In this paper, we will be looking at language practices in relation to power inequities based on ethnicity, race, and class - specifically the longstanding oppression of indigenous groups.

So long as we study language practices without attending to their role in reinforcing power structures, it seems unlikely that we will be able to propose changes in those practices that will lead to more equal power relationships. In other words, we need to ask not just "what" language means in a particular social context and "how" that meaning is

accomplished interactionally, but also "why" those particular meanings (out of all possible available meanings) were expressed in that particular interaction (cf. Pennycook 1994:116). Once we understand "why," we may be able to change the "whats" and the "hows" that reinforce social inequities.

Hand in hand with a shift in conceptual focus goes a shift in unit of analysis. If sociolinguistics broke with structural linguistics by studying speech communities rather than a homogeneous language, the more recent shift in unit of analysis is toward, "for instance, speakers in institutions who do not share interpretative rules; local populations of speakers viewed in relation to the policies or discourses of states; and contrasting groups of speakers differentially located within a political economic region" (Gal 1989:349). It is precisely in these contexts of "cross-cultural or intercultural communication, where 'notions of group membership and community can no longer be accepted as fixed characteristics and well-defined totalities' (Rampton 1992:54)" (Freeland 1998), that relationships among differing communities of speakers and ways of speaking are most evident (in the same way that sociolinguistic norms of interaction are most salient when they are breached and the existence of speech situations and events is most observable at their boundaries, cf. Hymes 1968:123; Hymes 1972:56; Saville-Troike 1989: 135-136). Interestingly, a recent review of research on multilingualism in England in the 1990s groups the research into five broad thematic headings - interaction styles, multiliteracies, codeswitching, language crossing, and language awareness (Rampton et al. 1997), all of which in fact involve multilingual language practices in just the kind of intercultural communicative contexts being highlighted above.

The present paper focuses on such an intercultural context as well - that of Andean indigenous groups and their languages in relation to the language and education policies affecting them. In an article on Aymara teacher training in Bolivia, Luykx rightly notes that

"when global capitalism and other belief systems penetrate daily practice in the remotest corners of the globe, indigenous groups can no longer be treated as closed social systems" (Luykx 1996:239). One of the vehicles of that penetration into indigenous ways of life in the Andes, as in other parts of the world, has been education. Whereas in the past, that education was exclusively Spanish in medium of instruction and urban and Western in content, the last quarter of this century has brought a shift in both policy and practice toward greater inclusion of indigenous language and content, usually under the label of bilingual intercultural education. This paper explores the whats, hows, and whys of that shift by analyzing samples of discourse at both the policy (macro) and practice (micro) levels. Specifically, I look at the use of the term intercultural in those discourses and "what" it means to the different groups using it, as a way of understanding "why" they use it and therefore to what degree and by what means ("how") this new education seeks to change the centuries-old subordination of indigenous groups to their national societies.

In the first section which follows, I take up the policy level, analyzing the current policy on bilingual intercultural education in each of these three Andean countries with significant indigenous populations - Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia. The next section looks at the practice level, or more accurately practitioners' constructions of the practice level, considering narratives composed by indigenous and non-indigenous, experienced and incipient, practitioners of bilingual intercultural education in those same three countries. The final section of the paper considers the degree to which contestation at the micro (practice) level of the macro (policy) level status quo appears to be an avenue for social change.

Three Policies on Bilingual Intercultural Education

If Bolivia, within the constellation of South American countries, has the highest percentage of indigenous language speakers as a proportion of its total population (63%), and Peru the highest absolute number of indigenous language speakers (6 million), Ecuador has perhaps

the strongest indigenous grassroots organization, CONAIE (*Confederación de Nacionalidades Indígenas del Ecuador*, Confederation of Indigenous Nationalities of Ecuador), even though its indigenous population, at approximately 2.5 million, comprises no more than a quarter of its total population (López 1995a: 22, 36, 25). Across the three countries, Quechua comprises the largest Amerindian language group, reaching a total of more than 10 million Quechua speakers. Aymara speakers number approximately 2 million, between Bolivia and Peru; there are about 60,000 Guarani speakers in Bolivia with another 3 million in neighboring Paraguay, Argentina, and Brazil; and numerous smaller languages, particularly Amazonian languages, make up the remaining indigenous language groups and speakers of these three countries.

Beginning in Peru in the 1970s, in Ecuador in the 1980s, and in Bolivia in the 1990s, major new national educational policies have evidenced a shift in societal discourse with respect to these indigenous languages and groups, away from the openly racist ideology of the past and toward a more inclusive, intercultural one.[1] Is this a truly substantive shift or a merely rhetorical one (cf. Luykx 1996: 248)? Mannheim has argued that across four centuries in Peru, two and only two ideological positions with respect to the use of indigenous languages and the existence of Quechua speakers as a separate people have maintained themselves with remarkable consistency, both positions ultimately assimilationist, albeit one more reactionary and the other more enlightened (Mannheim 1984: 303). Are the recent bilingual intercultural education policies simply a new guise for the "same old" enlightened assimilationism which yet maintains the hegemony of Spanish as the language of writing, of formal communication and of power (cf. López 1997) - or do they reflect a genuinely new intercultural ideology which seeks to incorporate indigenous languages, cultures, and ways of knowing into a new national identity ? In this paper, I explore this question by looking at both policy and practice level constructions of the

meaning of the term intercultural. Specifically, I will look at what cultural (ethnic, social) groups (identities) are represented and at how they are constructed as interacting.

How, after all, does a nation construct a multicultural, multilingual identity? While we may recognize that the equation one language-one nation is an ideological red herring (Woolard and Schieffelin 1994: 60-61), at the same time it has been a very powerful ideology. Like many developing nations, Andean states have long modeled themselves after the mythic/imaginary linguistically and culturally homogeneous nation-state. It is also undeniable that twin processes of globalization and ethnic fragmentation in our day exert pressures on the unitary nation-language ideal, from both without and within. Freeland notes that Latin American nations are particularly prone to two frequently mentioned effects of globalization: 1) the weakening of the state from the surge of transnational phenomena (pressure from without); and 2) the weakening of the state from social and ethnic fragmentation (pressure from within) (1996: 168). Gal suggests what might be considered a linguistic corollary to these pressures when she notes that global processes like colonization, the expansion of capitalism and transnational labor migration have replaced earlier processes of "dispersion of populations and the peopling of the world", such that: 1) the characteristic form of language change in the modern era is the coming together of languages (pressure from without); and 2) the former "relatively egalitarian linguistic diversity, based on small-scale languages whose speakers believe their own language to be superior, [has been changed] into stratified diversity: Local languages are abandoned or subordinated to 'world languages' in diglossic relations..." (1989:356) (pressure from within).

It is just these kinds of pressures that lead Luykx to assert, for the case of Bolivia, that "deep social inequalities, cultural and linguistic diversity, a conflictive history propelled by a strong working-class consciousness, and intense regional rivalries... define *'lo boliviano'*

[what is bolivian] ... but they also represent the forces which constantly pull any notion of a unified 'Bolivian society' away from a common center" (1996: 242-243). Given these pressures and tensions, the concept of nation and in particular of a truly multicultural nation, seems very elusive indeed.

Turning now to analyze how the current bilingual intercultural education policies of these three Andean countries address the construction of a multicultural multilingual national identity, we focus on the use of the term intercultural in selected key sections of these policies, looking at their constructions of culture or cultural groups and of intercultural interaction, respectively. Peru's first National Bilingual Education Policy and By-Laws, promulgated in 1972 and 1973 in conjunction with Peru's wide-ranging Education Reform, did not use the term intercultural at all. Nevertheless, López points out that the Puno Bilingual Education Project, which arose in the context of Peru's 1972 Bilingual Education Policy and operated throughout the 1980s, was in effect, even if not in name, intercultural (1991:180; see also Hornberger 1988a, 1988b, 1989 for more on the 1972 Policy and the Puno program). Pozzi-Escot notes that use of the term intercultural with reference to bilingual education emerged in Latin America only in 1980 at a meeting of indigenists in Pátzcuaro, Mexico, and that it arose as an alternative to the term bicultural because of challenges to the idea that an individual could be bicultural in the same sense as s/he could be bilingual (Pozzi-Escot 1991: 137). López suggests that, in addition, there was a political motivation for those adopting the term intercultural as a way of distancing themselves from the Summer Institute of Linguistics (SIL) which used the term bicultural in reference to their bilingual education programs (López 1991: 181; this was part of a larger political questioning of the SIL throughout Latin America).

The term intercultural is prominent, however, in Peru's current policy, the *Política Nacional de Educación Intercultural y Educación Bilingüe Intercultural* 'National

Intercultural Education and Bilingual Intercultural Education Policy', promulgated in the early 1990s by the National Bilingual Education Directorate *Dirección General de Educación Bilingüe* (DIGEBIL) for the 1991-1995 period and still in effect (Luis Enrique López, personal communication 19 September 1997). In the opening two sections, the *Fundamentación* 'Background' and the *Lineamientos de política* 'Policy guidelines' (in Godenzzi 1992: 301-306)[2], the term *intercultural* or *interculturalidad* 'interculturality' appears nine times (italicized in the Appendix). At the first mention, *interculturalidad* is defined as *el diálogo armónico entre culturas* 'harmonious dialogue among cultures'(6); it is further stated that *interculturalidad* should be *el principio rector del sistema educativo* 'the guiding principle throughout the educational system' (7) and that intercultural education is *para todos los peruanos* 'for all Peruvians' (7). These last two points are repeated in the policy guidelines, which then go on to state that *interculturalidad* will foster 'the strengthening of one's own cultural identity, self-esteem, respect, as well as cross-cultural understanding'(19); that it is 'essential for the social, economic, and cultural progress of communities, regions, and the country as a whole'(20); that 'for indigenous and peasant populations who speak a vernacular language, education will be bilingual as well as intercultural'(21); and that 'bilingual intercultural education will be encouraged at all levels and modalities of the educational system'(22). The concept of culture here is one of 'different ethnic groups'(1), each with 'their own language, culture, and history'(1); of interculturality as a harmonious dialogue among those groups; and of intercultural education as dealing equally with all. The implication is that all groups are on equal terms, and yet the policy also makes clear that the non-Spanish speaking groups will be required to learn at least two languages, while the Spanish-speaking groups will not. Given the context in which language shift is of longstanding and has been well-documented (Pozzi-Escot 1988), it would appear that assimilationism, albeit enlightened, is still the underlying ideology here.

Ecuador's Model of Intercultural Bilingual Education was promulgated on 31 August 1993 by the Ministry of Education and Culture and the National Directorate of Intercultural Bilingual Education (DINEIB), as the culmination of a lengthy and broadly consultative process with indigenous communities (Juan Aucancela, personal communication, 3 July 1997). The policy presents the model along with the complete curriculum for intercultural bilingual education, encompassing some 135 pages and numerous sections, of which I analyze here only two: the *Política estatal* 'State policy' and the *Fines* 'Purposes' (DINEIB 1994). Here, as in the Peruvian policy sections analyzed, the term *intercultural* or *interculturalidad* appears nine times (italicized in the Appendix).

Immediately striking in the first three mentions of the term, and in contrast with the approach in the Peruvian policy, is the association of intercultural education with the indigenous sector of the population: The State assumes responsibility to 'guarantee the continuity of intercultural bilingual education (IBE) for all the indigenous cultures' (2), no matter how few in number and 'throughout all levels and modalities of education' (2); and also to administer all IBE programs in conjunction with the indigenous organizations (3). No mention is made of intercultural education for non-indigenous populations. Indeed, the original name of the DINEIB at the time of its creation in 1989 was DINEIIB, with the additional "I" standing for Indigenous. Furthermore, through agreement between CONAIE and the Ministry of Education and Culture (MEC), indigenous persons assumed high level positions and responsibility for schools where more than half of the population is indigenous (King 1997: 39-40). Thus, intercultural bilingual education in Ecuador is in fact directed primarily at the indigenous sectors of the population.

Furthermore, the directionality of the interculturality is made clear in the next mention, where the policy spells out that the indigenous languages will be the 'principal languages of (intercultural bilingual) education' and Spanish will be the 'language of intercultural

relations' (4). The final three mentions of *intercultural* in this section assign means of implementation for guaranteeing a quality IBE: namely educational materials (6), legal and administrative dispositions (8), and the necessary funds for 'research, materials production, printing, short courses, and pay for teachers and administrative staff' (9). The term intercultural appears only twice in the section on 'Purposes', but the mention is significant in that the strengthening of *interculturalidad* in Ecuadorian society is cited as one of the three main purposes of IBE, the other two being to strengthen the cultural identity of indigenous peoples (13) and to contribute to the search for their better quality of life (14).

Although the directionality of intercultural relationship here, as in the Peruvian policy, continues to be for the indigenous populations to learn Spanish language and culture and not the reverse, there are two aspects of the use of the term here that seem to suggest a more grounded recognition of the indigenous languages and cultures; one is the focus on strengthening the indigenous communities and their cultural identities; the other is the attention to a means to implement the stated goals. These suggest an opening, a way for the indigenous communities to strengthen themselves and, through intercultural relations, reach into the dominant culture and society. Of significance here perhaps is the ordering of the terms intercultural and bilingual, the reverse of the usage in the Peruvian policy and in the forerunning PEBI project in Ecuador; reportedly, the precedence of intercultural over bilingual is not accidental, but the outcome of heated debate (Kendall King, personal communication, 18 December 1997) and perhaps intended to emphasize that there is a serious intention to build an intercultural society, and not just bilingual individuals.

Such a resolve seems even more firmly rooted in Bolivia's National Educational Reform of 1994, as expressed in the *Ley de Reforma Educativa* (#1565), promulgated on 7 July 1994 by the President and Congress (Bolivia, 1994). In the two sections analyzed here, *the Bases y fines de la educación boliviana* 'Foundations and purposes of Bolivian education'

(Title I) and the *Objetivos del sistema educativo* 'Objectives of the educational system' (Title II, Chapter 1), the term *intercultural* appears only once in each; however that use is strategic. In the section on Foundations and purposes, the fifth of eleven foundational points is that all Bolivian education is to be intercultural and bilingual, 'because it assumes the socio-cultural heterogeneity of the country in an atmosphere of respect for all, male and female' (6). Here, the intercultural nature of Bolivian education is held on a par with the other foundational characteristics of that education namely that it is universal (3), democratic (4), national (5), the right and duty of every citizen (7), revolutionary (8), progressive (9), and so on. Similarly, the intercultural nature of Bolivian education is highlighted as one of only eight overall objectives; specifically, 'to construct an intercultural and participatory educational system that facilitates educational access by all Bolivians, with no discrimination whatsoever' (18). [3]

Notable in the Bolivian policy is the two-way directionality of the concept of interculturality expressed there. Whereas both the Peruvian and the Ecuadorian policies seem to imply a one-way directionality where indigenous populations learn the majority language, Spanish, but not the reverse, the Bolivian policy is explicit that Spanish speakers will also learn an indigenous national language, within the so-called 'monolingual modality' (Title II, Chapter IV, Article 9, #2 Modalidades de lengua). Also notable in the Bolivian policy is the conception of socio-cultural heterogeneity expressed. Unlike the Peruvian policy which highlights ethnic groups, each with their own language, culture, and history, and equally unlike the Ecuadorian policy which focuses on indigenous cultures, their languages, identities, and communities, the Bolivian policy mentions a wider range of social identities, including not only ethnic and cultural diversity, but also differences of geographical-cultural region (Title I, Article I, #4), social, physical, mental, and sensory condition, gender, creed, and age (Title I, Article I, #6). Similarly, whereas the core of the notion of *interculturalidad* in the Peruvian policy seems to be that of a harmonious dialogue among

cultures from equal starting points, and of the Ecuadorian policy a strengthened indigenous identity as a starting point for intercultural outreach, in the Bolivian policy *interculturalidad* seems to be conceptualized as a strengthened national identity, based on respect among all Bolivians and discrimination against none.

Having looked at "how" the different policies use the term intercultural and what they seem to mean by it, it remains to ask the question "why" they have chosen to use the term at all. At least part of the answer lies in the different national contexts at the particular point in time when each policy emerged in and another part in the progressively linked evolution of Andean researchers' and policy makers' understandings of bilingual education. I mentioned above that the policy shift first became evident in Peru beginning in the 1970s, in Ecuador in the 1980s, and in Bolivia in the 1990s; but I did not mention that the sequence from decade to decade is not purely coincidental. Peru was one of the first Latin American nations to undertake radical leftist reform, beginning in 1968 with the overthrow of their elected democratic government by a leftist military regime, which called itself "Revolutionary" and immediately undertook a series of radical reforms including the expropriation of the petroleum industry, an agrarian reform, a social property reform, the Education Reform of 1972 and the Officialization of Quechua in 1975. Though the ideals of the Revolutionary Government were inclusive and democratic, it was nevertheless a top-down effort, and bilingual education and Quechua language planning were no exception. Both López (1987, 1988, 1989, 1996a) and Pozzi-Escot (1981, 1988, 1989, 1993) have written extensively about the origins and outcomes of the 1972 National Bilingual Education Policy and ensuing bilingual education programs, from which they draw implications for the future of bilingual education; both emphasize the importance of greater public awareness and local community level involvement in policy formulation and implementation. Freeland, too, while lauding the significant achievements of the Puno Bilingual Education Project, suggests that it lacked "one critical ingredient, the broad

popular support of grass-roots organisations capable of fighting for its survival" (1996:177).

In contrast, in Ecuador in the 1980s, there was already a significant grassroots indigenous movement in favor of bilingual education. Beginning from precursor organizations among the Shuar and other Amazonian groups, "a multitude of indigenous political organizations developed, merged, and realigned" throughout the 1970s and 1980s, culminating in the official recognition of the Confederation of Indigenous Ecuadorian Nationalities (CONAIE) by the Ecuadorian government in 1986 (King 1997: 33). Locally controlled indigenous bilingual education efforts also emerged in the 1970s (King 1997:34-35; Moya 1989), so that by the time the government officially recognized bilingual education in 1981 (Moya 1989:126), the indigenous organizations had already approved a unified variety of Quichua (Moya 1988:378-379). Throughout the 1980s and up to the present, the role of the indigenous organizations continues strong, a fact which as we saw is reflected in the strong indigenous component of the current intercultural bilingual education policy.

Bolivia in the 1990s combines elements of both Peru of the 1970s and Ecuador of the 1980s, in that while the Educational Reform emanates from the highest levels of government, it has been formulated in close conjunction with another major reform, the Law of Popular Participation, also launched in 1994, which explicitly calls for and sets the parameters for local community control of government resources, and which has already yielded considerable local mobilization and empowerment (Hornberger and López forthcoming, López 1995b). The Educational Reform and the Popular Participation Law are the institutional foundations for the construction of a new State in which pluralism is seen as a resource and not a problem (cf. Ruiz 1984), and this intention is also evident in the meanings given to the term intercultural in the Educational Reform Law, as we saw above. It is also worth noting that Bolivia's Educational Reform stands on the shoulders of

a vigorous indigenous political presence (dating back to Bolivia's 1952 Revolution and with roots much earlier than that), epitomized in the person of Victor Hugo Cárdenas, indigenous Aymara educator and Vice President of Bolivia at the time the Reform was enacted; and a series of bilingual education experiences beginning in the 1960s, including projects sponsored by USAID, the World Bank, SIL and the Catholic Church, as well as SENALEP, the national popular education and literacy plan in the 1980s (Plaza and Albó 1989), and even more recently, the highly successful indigenous Guarani literacy campaign (López 1996b).

However, as I noted above, it is not only the distinct national contexts that account for differing interpretations of interculturality in the three countries' policies, but also the linked evolution in thinking about bilingual education in the Andean and Latin American context. If it is true, as Freeland asserts, that the spread of the Puno model of interculturality, a "paradoxical conjuncture of national context, international technical advice and local cultural constructs" is due in large degree to its acceptability to weak states lacking a truly pluralistic hegemony (1996:179), it is also true, as I think I have shown above, that the model has evolved and strengthened to become both more locally and more nationally rooted as it has moved to Ecuador and Bolivia.

In this regard, the role of a small core of individuals and a handful of sponsor organizations over time and across national boundaries has been crucial. While a thoroughgoing intellectual history is beyond the scope of this paper, I note here in passing the contributions of UNESCO-OREALC (*Oficina Regional de Educación para América Latina y el Caribe*, Regional Education Office for Latin America and the Caribbean), which has spurred Andean and Latin American dialogue on bilingual education through the medium of regional seminars and publications (e.g. UNESCO/OREALC 1986; UNESCO/OREALC 1987; Zúñiga et al. 1987; UNICEF/OREALC/UNESCO 1989; Chiodi 1990), the GTZ

(*Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit*, German Agency for Technical Cooperation) which spearheaded significant experimental bilingual education projects in *convenio* 'agreement' with the national governments of Peru (1979 to 1990) and Ecuador (1986 to 1993); and of individuals such as Luis Enrique López, who served as technical expert in the Puno Bilingual Education Project throughout most of the 1980s, was founder and first director of the graduate program in Andean Linguistics and Education at the National University of the Altiplano in Puno, advisor to the Bolivian Education Reform, and currently is Director of the Andean Intercultural Bilingual Education Program (PROEIB-Andes) at San Simón University in Cochabamba, Bolivia; he has also consulted on bilingual education in Ecuador, Guatemala, Nicaragua, and has published widely on these topics. López, and a handful of other Andean scholars such as Xavier Albó, Rodolfo Cerrón-Palomino, Juan Carlos Godenzzi, Ruth Moya, Pedro Plaza, Madeleine Zúñiga, and the late Inés Pozzi-Escot, have had a profound influence on the direction and development of bilingual intercultural education in the Andes during these decades; in their writings we can trace a parallel evolution of the concept of intercultural to that we have seen in the policies above.

The above analysis of intercultural bilingual education policies in Peru, Ecuador, and Bolivia has highlighted several dimensions of interculturality. Specifically, the dimensions include: the groups involved in the interculturality (whether they be different ethnic groups, indigenous groups juxtaposed against non-indigenous groups, or more broadly heterogeneous sociocultural groups); whether the interculturality is one-way or multidirectional; and the nature of the interculturality (whether as dialogue among cultures, respect for others, the strengthening of one's own local cultural identity and of the national identity, the search for a better quality of life, or some combination of these). We turn now to a consideration of how these evolving concepts of interculturality are realized in practitioners' construction of their practice, by examining short narratives by bilingual

education practitioners, experienced and in-preparation, indigenous and non-indigenous, in the three countries (most native to those countries, and a few outside, informed observers). The same dimensions as above guide the analysis of the narratives, summarized in the two basic questions which address "culture" and "intercultural" respectively: first, what are the cultural (social) identities (groups) represented? and secondly, how do these different cultural groups interact?

Narratives on Bilingual Intercultural Education Practice

The narratives to be analyzed were written by students in two courses on bilingual education and language planning that I taught in Cusco, Peru and Cochabamba, Bolivia during 1997. The Cusco course was one of several required courses in an intensive summer graduate program in Andean Linguistics and Bilingual Education at the University Andean College of the Las Casas Center for Andean Regional Studies, the premier social science research institution of Southern Peru. The Cochabamba course was taught at San Simón University in the Faculty of Humanities, as one of four preparatory modules for a new graduate program in Intercultural Bilingual Education (PROEIB-Andes), launched in the wake of Bolivia's 1994 National Education Reform, and directed by Luis Enrique López.

Both courses drew a diverse group of students, but the diversity was expressed differently in each case. The University Andean College in Cusco had made a special effort to secure funds to bring practicing bilingual education professionals from neighboring countries to its intensive program and as a result, the Cusco course benefitted from strong Bolivian and Ecuadorian contingents (6 each) in addition to the scattering of representation from various regions of Peru, other South American countries (Argentina, Chile, and Colombia) and the world (England, Spain, Switzerland and the US). The Ecuadorian group, in particular, who were all part of (or closely linked to) the DINEIB, provided a valuable indigenous

presence and insiders' viewpoint regarding the challenges and satisfactions of implementing indigenous bilingual education.

The Bolivian course, on the other hand, had neither the wide international representation nor the proudly indigenous presence seen in the Cusco course. Here, most of the students were Bolivian, and indeed Cochabambinos (residents of Cochabamba), and the diversity lay instead in the routes which brought them to an interest in bilingual education. Several spoke Quechua as a native language (as well as Spanish), although few of these would identify themselves - by word or behavior - as indigenous; nevertheless, they had multiple years of experience teaching Quechua at the secondary or university level or in private language institutes, and in the course of that experience had come to value their native language and culture. Others, even further estranged from their indigenous roots (or perhaps without such roots), sought to (re)discover them through exploration of indigenous language and culture and an understanding of the nature of *interculturalidad*, within the person as well as within the nation. Still others, already professionals in education, psychology, anthropology, or linguistics, evinced their sense of the increasing need to better understand the distinct languages and cultures of the Bolivian context in order to carry out their profession. Very few of the students had much practical experience with bilingual education, but all were enthusiastic about its potential.

In both courses, all students were assigned to write a one-page narrative vignette depicting an instance of interculturality in an educational setting and it is those narratives which I analyze here. There was a total of 57 narratives: 28 from the Cusco course and 29 from the Cochabamba course; by 35 female and 22 male authors; 47 authors were from Peru (10), Ecuador (5), and Bolivia (32), and 10 from other countries (4 from Argentina and Colombia; 6 from beyond South America). For my present purposes, rather than analyzing by gender or nationality grouping, I chose to focus on all the narratives together as a group

in order to allow the categories of analysis to emerge from the content of the narratives themselves. Here is what emerged:

1) groups represented in the encounter - e.g. Spanish speakers, Quechua speakers, other indigenous groups, etc.

2) setting depicted - e.g. rural school, urban school, adult education, etc.

3) author's positioning - insider or outsider

4) point of culture in focus - e.g. belief systems, language, traditional practices, etc.

5) outcome of encounter - positive or negative.

The first three of these will be discussed in this section on the narratives; the remaining two will be taken up in the final section on micro to macro contestation.

Taking first the question of what cultural groups are represented in the narratives (#1 above), the majority of the narratives (33 out of 57, or 58%) depict an encounter between Spanish speakers and Quechua speakers; 13 depict encounters between different indigenous language groups, 7 between speakers of Spanish and indigenous languages and 6 between speakers of Spanish and non-indigenous languages.[4] Of significance here are the terms in which these groups are identified. Across the narratives, five kinds of oppositions are most often invoked to identify the groups involved: (1) language (Quechua vs. Spanish, or Aymara vs. Spanish, etc.), (2) rural vs. urban (usually in terms of *campo* 'countryside' or *comunidad* 'community' vs. *ciudad* 'city'), (3) indigenous vs. non-indigenous, (4) *niños* 'children' or 'students' vs. *profesor* 'teacher', and (5) *campesino* 'peasant' vs. *maestro* 'teacher' or *criollo* 'creole / mestizo' or *minero* 'miner'. Of these, language and the rural-urban opposition are most frequent; each appearing in 35, or 61%, of the 57 narratives. Comparatively few narratives (15) invoke a cultural category such as Quechuas or Tobas or Napurunas or indigenous people, and even fewer (8) a professional or economic category, such as *campesino*, *obrero* 'laborer', or *minero*.

Twenty-two (39%) of the narratives invoke both the Quechua-Spanish and rural-urban oppositions, evidence of a conflation whereby Quechua language becomes a marker for rural attributes and vice-versa. Experienced Quechua (and Aymara) language teacher David Mamani,[5] for example, opens his narrative with the statement: 'I would like to imagine myself working in the countryside with Quechua speaking children'; Bolivian University linguistics student Lidia López begins with: 'In the majority of rural schools, the boys and girls have Quechua = L1 and Spanish = L2'; Peruvian secondary school teacher Tomás Cuenca retells a traditional folktale of the fox and the *wallata* 'large wading bird' to demonstrate that 'Quechua speaking parents (foxes) want their children to be like city children (*wallatas*), at all costs.' I interpret this identification of Quechua-and-rural, Spanish-and-urban, as an example of what Gal calls iconicization, a semiotic process whereby "linguistic features that index social groups or activities come to appear to be iconic representations of them" (Gal 1997:8; also Gal and Irvine 1995, who call it iconicity). In this case, iconicization would account for the fact that rural characteristics have become naturalized as "Quechua." According to Gal, this and other semiotic processes (recursiveness and erasure, to which we will return below) are processes "by which people construct ideological representations of the linguistic differences they notice" (1997:7-8) and which in turn construct and reinforce language boundaries.

Analysis of the settings in which intercultural encounters are portrayed in the narratives (#2 above) sheds further light on the rural-urban opposition and its relation to language ideology. Of the 39 school settings in the narratives, 21 are rural and 18 urban, 3 of these last specified as urban periphery.[6] As might be expected, the rural settings make the Quechua-Spanish encounter salient because of the imposition of Spanish curriculum on a rural Quechua-speaking population and the potential to break through the dominant ideology by introducing the use of Quechua. Interestingly, though, there are also narratives drawing attention to the fact of Quechua speakers and students of Quechua origin

in urban schools, particularly night schools or schools in the urban periphery, where the same opportunity exists. Four narratives about schools in the city of Cochabamba exemplify this: in the first, a teacher in a non-bilingual primary school decided to incorporate the use of Quechua in reading stories and eliciting vocabulary (María Torres); the second tells of a successful unit on health and medicine, incorporating the use of written and spoken Quechua, taught at a primary school in the urban periphery (Elena Martín); another tells of a teacher in an adult night school class who assigned her students to make up ads for 'national articles and products, ... written in Quechua' (Nacha Vélez); and the last tells how the author proposed and implemented the substitution of Quechua classes for French and English foreign language classes at the secondary school where she teaches (Sonia de la Torre). In every case, the result was animated and enthusiastic participation in Quechua by students who were before either unable to understand (when taught in Spanish) or reticent to use their mother tongue Quechua. The significant point here is that the 'urban' students in these narratives are all shown to be Quechua speakers.

It would appear, then, that the urban-rural opposition is being reframed, within the urban sphere, in terms of a core-periphery opposition, a process which Gal and Irvine term recursiveness, or the "projection of an opposition between categories of identity, salient at some level of relationship, onto some other level " (Gal 1997:8; also Gal and Irvine 1995:974). Recursiveness is evident here in the projection of the rural-urban opposition onto an intra-urban opposition between periphery and center.

One of the cultural groupings which do not appear in these narratives is gender groupings, with only one exception. Bolivian university teacher Lincoln Pérez tells of a primary mathematics class he observed where the teacher called her students' attention to an illustration in their math materials which portrayed children in clothing different from their own, drawing the students out in conversation about where these children might be from

and what their life might be like, and similarities and differences with their own. Notably, the children of migrant parents seemed to be more receptive and imaginative in this discussion than the children whose parents are more traditional and rooted to the community; so, too, "the girls have much more interest than the boys in knowing and accepting cultural differences." This exceptional observation notwithstanding, however, attention to gender is more notable for its absence than its presence in the narratives analyzed here, a fact which could be due to the context in which the vignettes were assigned (a class on bilingual education and language policy), but might also be interpreted in terms of the third of Gal and Irvine's semiotic processes in the construction of language ideology, namely the process of erasure, which "renders some persons or activities or sociolinguistic phenomena invisible" (Gal and Irvine 1995:974; also Gal 1997: 9). In this case, erasure would operate to render gender differences invisible within the rural-urban, Quechua-Spanish oppositions (cf. Freeland 1998).[7]

Turning now to the question of how the narratives depict the cultural groups interacting (the "intercultural" question), I consider first the author's own positioning of him/herself in relation to the intercultural encounter (#3 above). Here, the narratives were almost evenly divided between insider and outsider positioning by the author, 31 and 26 respectively. What is perhaps even more significant is that of the 31 positioning themselves inside the encounter, 12 also depicted themselves as undergoing some kind of change in attitude or understanding as a result of the encounter. Two Ecuadorian narratives exemplify this. In the first, indigenous bilingual education practitioner Sisa Pinsaqui tells that when she first went to university and the professors talked a lot about interculturality, 'I [Sisa] thought that this would not be of interest to Spanish speakers because they had the idea of making the indigenous people disappear, so I did not pay any attention when they tried to talk about our problem.' She goes on to tell how the hispanic students organized a roundtable, at which she began to feel that they had 'become conscious of our existence.' After the

conversation at the roundtable, the indigenous students presented a short dramatic presentation, upon which the 'Spanish speaking friends were surprised... and told me that indigenous people have a treasure in their communities... and they said "we are going to work toward intercultural practice with forums, and meetings"... I thought that [the experience] was a dream, but it was real and will stay with me and with them all our lives.'

In a similar vein, but from a different starting point, non-indigenous teacher and bilingual education advocate Francisco Guayas tells of his visit to a Quichua community soon after he started learning to speak Quichua 12 years ago. He was invited to a meeting on 'Sunday at 10 in the morning.' He arose early to travel by bus to the community and arrived at about 9:45, but found no one present. After about a half hour, a woman came by carrying a load of hay and he attempted a short conversation in Quichua, as follows:

'FG: What time will the meeting begin, little mother [term of affection]?

W: When the people arrive.

FG: And about how long will it last?

W: That will depend on the points to be discussed, little friend [term of friendship].

FG: But, about what time will it end?

W: When we have finished with all the points to be discussed.'

Garcés goes on to comment that, although he had read about different conceptions of time and space, this was his first lived experience with a Quichua conception of time and that it was from this point that he 'began to really learn about and respect the Quichua world. To tell the truth, there are still many things I don't understand, but I do try to respect them.'

In what does interculturality consist for these practitioners (as reflected in their narratives)? For them, it is not enough simply to bring different cultural groups into juxtaposition; there must also be interaction and dialogue, indeed dialogic interaction. Various recent typologies in the field of cultural diversity and education portray this need as well. For example,

Rampton et al. (1997) outline four orientations to cultural diversity in education in the UK: deficit, difference, domination, and discourse, each with its respective view of culture, approach to language, and intervention strategy (among other characteristics). In their typology, the discourse orientation which has come to the fore in the 1990s views culture as processes of dialogical negotiated sense-making (rather than as elite canon, sets of values/beliefs/behaviors, or reflection of socio-economic relations, as in the other orientations) and it adopts anti-essentialism as an intervention strategy (to be distinguished from assimilation, multiculturalism, or the anti-racism/anti-imperialism of the other orientations, respectively).

Another recent survey summarizes styles adopted in contemporary diversity education practice in the US, placing the styles on a continuum from most information-oriented to actual coalition-building-oriented, ranging from Entertainment style through Planting Agents to Nurturing style.[8] The authors of the survey are quite explicit about the need to take diversity education beyond the informational stage to actual engagement in coalition-building; and they emphasize the "critical need for disclosure of inner lives for the hard work of diversity education and exploration to be completed successfully" (Sawyer 1997).

Similarly, there is recognition in a number of the narratives analyzed here that interculturality must begin with one's self, with developing an understanding of one's own identity. Given the complex array of social categories in play in these contexts, this is not necessarily an easy matter. Writing about Bolivian Aymaras studying to be teachers at Normal School, Luykx (1996) argues that their socialization necessarily involves "coming to grips with the fact that the achievement of professional status [will] distance them from their ethnic and class origins, while simultaneously requiring them to live and work among those from whom they [have] differentiated themselves" (1996:246). She goes on to describe one manifestation of the ambiguity and complexity inherent in the process of their

identity construction; while the students (and most professors) clearly considered themselves to belong to the "ethnic category of *los aymaras* [Aymaras], *los indios* [Indians], or *el pueblo indígena* [indigenous people], the picture was complicated by the inclusion of the term *campesino* [peasant]" (1996:250). As she goes on to explain, the use of the term *campesino* in the "postrevolutionary period as a politically correct substitute for the epithet *indio* was an attempt not only to disallow a key marker of racism from legitimate public discourse, but also to de-emphasize ethnicity in favor of class," an effort which was however "not completely successful," with the end result being that the term *campesino* has now become disarticulated with a strictly class meaning and partly rearticulated with an ethnic one (1996:250). Hence, the ambiguity for an Aymara teacher, who is no longer a *campesino* in the class sense, but remains ethnically associated with the term.

This is but one example of a range of interacting social identities in play in Bolivia (and the Andes) today. I already mentioned above the interaction between rural-urban and Quechua-Spanish identities, and the weakening of the iconicization process which has heretofore bound them together; Luykx' argument above suggests that a similar iconicization between Aymara (or Quechua) and *campesino* identities is also weakening. Albó suggests that it will be up to the popular sectors to perceive their own identities and "begin to elaborate... their own project of a future society" and that the dimensions or identities that will come into consideration include not just social class (which social scientists have often supposed to be the only relevant category), but also ethnic and racial identities (African-American, Indian, mixed race), different cultural expressions (e.g. popular religion or language), countryside-city and capital-periphery relations, regionalisms, women's movements, and so on (1995:20).

In answer to the two organizing questions for this section, then, we have seen: first, that the cultural (social) identities (groups) involved are far more complex than the essentialized

designations by language name would suggest; and second, that there is at least an incipient recognition that interculturality must be based on dialogic interaction among different cultural groups, self-consciously defined. I turn now to an exploration of examples from the narratives of just such intercultural interactions and the degree to which it seems possible that they might contribute to a new ideological and social reality in these three Andean countries.

Contestation from Micro to Macro

As we have said above, to introduce indigenous languages and cultures into formal education in these Andean contexts produces an ideological paradox inherent in transforming a standardizing education into a diversifying one and constructing a national identity which is also multilingual and multicultural. We have looked at "what" the term intercultural means in recent bilingual education policy and practitioner discourse in these contexts in an attempt to understand "why" it is used these ways. It remains now to consider what the practitioner narratives tell us about "how" the new bilingual intercultural education seeks to change the centuries-old subordination of indigenous groups to their national societies, that is, "how" language practices may not only reinforce, but also challenge existing power inequities.

The narratives focus on various cultural sites or practices as points around which interculturality is depicted (#4 above). The largest number of narratives (27, or 47%) focus on language practices of some kind, including specific mention of writing (4), poetry (2), and stories (7); others refer to other communicative genres such as drama, song, advertising, or to other cultural practices such as those relating to earning a living, marriage and child-rearing, clothing, beliefs and values.

Early in her career, Bolivian teacher of English and Quechua Julia Pino Quispe was assigned to a school in a mining center; upon her arrival on 1 May, the Director told her that one of her responsibilities was to organize the annual celebration of Mother's Day on 27 May. She worked hard and organized 'dances, comic toys, presents for the mothers, and other activities'; but what stands out most in her memory of that event is

'a girl who was frequently marginalized in her class because she was of peasant origin and this was still noticeable in her speech and she offered to participate with a poem in Quechua which told of someone who had lost her mother and could not be consoled in her grief. The poem, of course, made the greatest impression and all were astonished because the form in which she interpreted the poem in Quechua could not have provided more originality nor more sense of life to all those who had the good fortune to be present. After this event, the girl was no longer excluded from any group; on the contrary it served to enable her to value her capacity to be included and it also served as a good example to her classmates.'

Peruvian teacher Concepción Anta tells of her work in an urban secondary school in Cajamarca (northern Peru), where she finds that using local materials and natural resources enables her to work successfully with her students, who come from the outskirts of the city and are of very limited economic means. For example, 'in a language class, where I am working with stories, I prefer to choose a peasant story, from a district or province of Cajamarca, worthy material from the locality, rather than choose a foreign story. First, I tell them the story and then with them we proceed to dramatize the story, using local materials from their own area; and finally with them we select some music to make a song from the story; this is something which they find very entertaining.... what I seek is for all aspects of the student or the person to continue functioning always as an integrated whole, ...where man's lived experience is in conjunction with the life of the animals, the plants, the hills, the cliffs, the rivers, the stars, the fields, etc.'

Erickson adopts the metaphor of *bricolage*, taken from Levi-Strauss' work, to argue that just as the *bricoleur*, a French all-purpose handyman, uses pre-structured materials to do the work at hand, so too "the local social actor often works in practice as a bricoleur" (Erickson 1997:38), transforming the materials at hand at the micro level (in this case, discourse) to serve a purpose different from that dictated by social structure at the macro level (or Discourse, following Gee 1990:142). In a similar vein, Gal suggests that there is evidence of resistance to dominant discourse practices in ethnographic studies of oral performance genres of: women, local elites, and working class and minority speakers in core and peripheral capitalism (1989:360). In the cases above, teacher Julia and the little girl who performs a poem in Quechua, teacher Concepción and her class performing a local peasant story with local materials and local music, are engaged in exactly this kind of micro-level contestation of dominant discourse practices via *bricolage*. In each case, the actors have made use, in school contexts, of language and content which have historically been excluded from the school, and have thereby used their discourse to serve a purpose different from that dictated by hegemonic Spanish, western, urban formal education practice.

Luykx provides another example in the Andean context, describing how Bolivian Aymara teachers-in-preparation resist the dominant discourse through expressive practices of parody and satire inserted within institutional discursive spaces such as the weekly *hora cívica* 'civic hour' program or the special variety shows for graduation and Mother's Day at the Normal School where they study. At the Mother's Day show, for example, they present a play about a working class Aymara family who sends their oldest son abroad, in which the "funniest moments involved the convoluted negotiation of ethnic and linguistic boundaries," such as getting a passport picture, or the writing of a letter in which the younger brother serves as scribe to his mother's dictation (Luykx 1996:258). She goes on

to affirm "the value of resistant cultural practices in strengthening bonds of collective identity" (264) and suggests that the truth of these events lies in their potential - in the sense of both "possibility and the as-yet-unrealized nature of that possibility" (1996:265). Like the example of these Aymara teachers-in-preparation, the narratives above by bilingual education practitioners (experienced and in-preparation) are instances of speakers using "microstructures of interaction to ... transform, not only the bureaucratic institutions, but also their own often stigmatized social identities" (Gal 1989: 353); they are, indeed, Andean *bricoleurs*, in Erickson's sense.

The majority of the narratives (39, or 68%) portray a positive interculturality (#5 above), confirming the sense of possibility Luykx suggests. Even those portraying a negative outcome suggest an informed sense of the potential for microlevel interaction to cumulatively effect change at the macrolevel. Two non-Andean bilingual education observer-practitioners (one in-preparation and the other experienced) each narrate an incident of missed intercultural sharing in an Andean context, and each propose an alternative. The first is a visit to a rural school by a foreigner who brought cookies to share with the students, an act which led, first, to his being physically besieged by the children and, second, to their being physically punished by the teacher, neither of which was the visitor's desired outcome. Both the visitor and narrator conclude that good intentions are not enough when it comes to intercultural encounters; next time, they decide, the visitor will bring potatoes rather than cookies (Henrik Klein). While potatoes instead of cookiers may be a rather simplistic solution to a deeper problem of intercultural mismatch, it does evidence a readiness for microlevel adaptation on the part of one participant in an effort to achieve a macrolevel goal of positive intercultural encounter.

The second account is of an observed natural science lesson in which the teacher uses oral Quechua while reading and writing in Spanish; however, he also uses a non-Quechua

classification of living beings, such that animals and plants are included, but rocks (volunteered by the students) are not. The narrator then goes on to describe an imaginary version of the same lesson which would be truly intercultural: here, the teacher would start with the Quechua conceptual scheme, discussing it thoroughly with the class; then and only then would he turn to the Spanish scheme, discussing again what 'living being' means in that language and worldview. In this lesson, both conceptual schemes would be given equal weight and students would be encouraged to compare and contrast them and to draw upon the one they know as the basis to build the second (Mette Klopf).

Two Bolivian indigenous educators provide positive examples of intercultural encounters. Native Aymara-speaking teacher Pablo Quispe Huayra tells of being assigned to teach in a Quechua-speaking area. Since the children in the early grades could not understand Spanish, the parents had contracted a translator to work with the teacher in class, but one day the translator was not there. 'Nevertheless, the next day was to be a civic act to receive the district authorities. At the end of the day I reminded them in Spanish but the first and second graders didn't understand me ... they laughed among themselves and spoke their own language. Immediately, I changed languages, using some words I had learned during my stay there, "Listen, until tomorrow, wash, ..., hair, hands"... they laughed at what their teacher had learned. Only then did I really communicate with my students, even though I spoke badly. For the Quechuas, an Aymara teacher was a gringo in Quechua lands.' Here is a teacher who reaches out from one indigenous group to another, thereby jointly constructing an intercultural national identity.

Similarly, bilingual education advocate and Ministry of Education employee Rosa Rumi tells of an encounter between a group of bilingual educators and elders of the Trinitarian culture, at the closing of the II Congress on Intercultural Bilingual Education, held in Santa Cruz, Bolivia.

'The elders told of the times when they were lords of these lands and they also remembered their dances and songs about their own cultural activities. They were hunters, and so represented a dance about how to hunt... They explained to us that through dances like these and the words of songs like those they performed for us, they used to teach their sons to be good hunters and good men who would provide sufficient food for their people....They remembered with sadness that their people are now thrown off their lands and live without many animals to hunt; for this reason, they live in bad conditions and are hungry.... They don't understand why the *carai* 'whites' have broken the old ways of life and impose other ways that are not useful to them.... They see that, today, the school educates children to leave their parents, their people, their lands... This was a sad and difficult reflection for all the educators who were present at the event.' Although the experience of the Trinitarians is certainly a sad one, there is also a representation of positive interculturality in this narrative in the sharing and emerging solidarity between the Trinitarians and the educators.

With Albó, I find most hope for the construction of a solid (and truly intercultural) national identity "with those projects that arise out of class, ethnic, cultural, and gender groups that most clearly suffer the history of inequality, exploitation, and discrimination..." (1995:22); with him, too, I believe that such a national identity need not necessarily imply "exclusivity, a maximum loyalty above all others" (1995:29), but that identities are always multiple and overlapping so that one may feel oneself to be Peruvian (or Bolivian), Quechua (or Aymara), woman (or man), peasant farmer (or teacher), and still be one person. Indeed, it is precisely those varied identity groups that can in local practice together construct a national, intercultural identity. Along these lines, Freeland argues for targeting international aid to the development of institutions occupying intermediate levels between international and domestic, global and national, in that way strengthening the local groups by means of global linkages (thereby, making them "glocal," 1996:187); she offers

the example of the REFLECT adult literacy program (Regenerated Freirian Literacy through Empowering Community Techniques), which combines local attention and global generalizability through the use of a "mother" manual adapted to each local site (1998; Archer and Cottingham 1996a,b).[9]

Consistent with the shift in discourse at the policy level described earlier, we have seen, in the above narratives about practice, instances of local action addressed to changing the longstanding discourse of racism and discrimination to one of intercultural understanding and collaboration. The construction of the term 'intercultural' to mean using oral performance to contest dominant practices and negotiating across cultural groups through language and discourse suggests that, for these practitioners, discourse is not only a way of uncovering language ideology and its links to language structure, language use, and political economy, but more importantly, of changing them. To the extent that all of us who are engaged in constructing interculturality can keep our focus not on "how" discourses reflect social reality, but on "how" they produce social realities (Pennycook 1994: 131), we will be able to move beyond rhetoric to reality, and beyond paradox to realized possibilities.

---

* The narrative texts analyzed in this paper were gathered while I was teaching in Peru and Bolivia during July and August 1997. I am grateful to Luis Enrique López and Juan Carlos Godenzzi for inviting me to teach, and to the Goldie Anna Professorship at the University of Pennsylvania Graduate School of Education for additional financial support.

[1] The 1970s in Peru saw the 1972 Educational Reform and its accompanying National Bilingual Education Policy, as well as the initiation of the Puno Bilingual Education Project in 1979 (see Hornberger 1988a, 1988b, López 1988, Pozzi-Escot 1981, 1988); the 1980s in Ecuador saw the official recognition of bilingual education in 1981, the start of the Intercultural Bilingual Education Project (PEBI) in 1986, and the founding of the DINEIB in 1989 (see Abram 1992); and the 1990s in Bolivia ushered in the major Educational Reform of 1994 (see Hornberger & King 1996, Hornberger & Lopez forthcoming).

[2] The original Spanish texts of the sections of the three documents analyzed here are included in the appendix. I have numbered the sentences (or phrases) for reference purposes. Here and throughout, translations from the Spanish are by me, and are enclosed in single quotation marks (whether or not I include the original Spanish in the text).

[3] The other objectives relate to human resource development (14), assessment (15), quality and efficiency (16), self-directed learning (17), democratization (19), manual arts (20), and higher education (21).

[4] The total here adds up to more than 57 because a few narratives depict three or more groups in the encounter.

[5] All names of narrative authors are pseudonyms.

[6] Other settings are: a soccer game (1), store or market (2), traditional legend (2), health or social work setting (3), and community or nation at large (10).

[7] I should note however, that there are some indications that this erasure is beginning to recede. Freeland notes that many Latin American governments now have 'gender' sub-sections in certain Ministries, such as education (1998); this is the case in Bolivia and Peru. Furthermore, dialogue about gender is beginning to surface, as it did for example in both my classes - at the periphery however.

[8] The complete typology is: Entertainment or Hollywood Diversity, Lecture Style or Preaching, Confrontational /Oppression or Cow Poke Style, Periodic Visits or The Road Show, Self-Exploration or Group Therapy, Planting Agents or The Militia, Non-Explicit / Hidden Agenda Style, Retreat Style or Obstacle Course, Nurturing or Uncle / Aunt Style (Smith et al. 1997).

[9] The program has been piloted since 1994 by the British NGO ActionAid in Bangladesh, Uganda, and El Salvador (Freeland 1998; also Archer & Cottingham 1996a).

References

Abram, M. (1992). Lengua, Cultura e Identidad: El Proyecto EBI 1985-1990. Quito, Ecuador: Ediciones Abya-Yala.

Albó, X. (1995). Our identity starting from pluralism in the base. In J. Beverley, M. Aronna, & J. Oviedo (Eds.) The Postmodernism Debate in Latin America (pp. 18-33). Durham, North Carolina: Duke University Press.

Archer, D., & Cottingham, S. (1996a). Education Action 6 (June).

Archer, D., & Cottingham, S. (1996b). The REFLECT Mother Manual: A New Approach to Literacy. Somerset, England: ActionAid.

Bolivia (1994). Ley de Reforma Educativa. La Paz, Bolivia: Secretaría Nacional de Educación, Ministerio de Desarrollo Humano.

Chiodi, F. (1990). La Educación Indígena en América Latina. Santiago, Chile and Quito, Ecuador: UNESCO/OREALC/Abya-Yala/P.EBI(MEC-GTZ).

DINEIB (Dirección Nacional de Educación Intercultural Bilingüe) (1994). Modelo de educación intercultural bilingüe. Pueblos Indígenas y Educación, 29-30, 5-142.

Erickson, F. (1997). Discourse analysis as a communication chunnel: How feasible is a linkage between Continental and Anglo-American approaches? Unpublished manuscript.

Freeland, J. (1996). The global, the national and the local: Forces in the development of education for indigenous peoples -- the case of Peru. Compare, 26(2), 167-195.

Freeland, J. (1998). An interesting absence: The gendered study of language and linguistic diversity in Latin America. International Journal of Educational Development 18(3).

Gal, S. (1989). Language and political economy. Annual Review of Anthropology, 18, 345-367.

Gal, S. (1997). Making boundaries: How language ideologies construct difference. Unpublished manuscript.

Gal, S., & Irvine, J. T. (1995). The boundaries of languages and disciplines: How ideologies construct difference. Social Research, 62(4), 967-1001.

Gee, J. P. (1990). Social Linguistics and Literacies: Ideology in Discourses. London: Falmer Press.

Godenzzi, J. C. (Ed.). (1992). El Quechua en Debate: Ideología, Normalización y Enseñanza. Cusco, Peru: Centro Bartolomé de Las Casas.

Hornberger, N. H. (1988a). Bilingual Education and Language Maintenance: A Southern Peruvian Quechua Case. Dordrecht, Holland: Foris Publications.

Hornberger, N. H. (1988b). Language planning orientations and bilingual education in Peru. Language Problems and Language Planning, 12(1), 14-29.

Hornberger, N. H. (1989). Can Peru's rural schools be agents for Quechua language maintenance? Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 10(2), 145-159.

Hornberger, N. H., & King, K. A. (1996). Language revitalisation in the Andes: Can the schools reverse language shift? Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development, 17(6), 427-441.

Hornberger, N. H., & López, L. E. (forthcoming). Policy, possibility and paradox: Indigenous multilingualism and education in Bolivia and Peru. In J. Cenoz & F. Genesee (Eds.), Beyond Bilingualism: Multilingualism and Multilingual Education Clevedon, England: Multilingual Matters.

Hymes, D. H. (1968). The ethnography of speaking. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), Readings in the Sociology of Language (pp. 99-138). The Hague: Mouton.

Hymes, D. H. (1972). Models of the interaction of language and social life. In J. Gumperz & D. Hymes (Eds.), Directions in Sociolinguistics: The Ethnography of Communication (pp. 35-71). New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

King, K. (1997). Language Revitalization in the Andes: Quichua Instruction, Use, and Identity in Saraguro, Ecuador. Ph.D., University of Pennsylvania.

López, L. E. (1987). Balance y perspectivas de la educación bilingüe en Puno. In M. Zúñiga, J. Ansion, & L. Cueva (Eds.), Educación en Poblaciones Indígenas: Politicas y Estrategias en América Latina (pp. 239-255). Santiago, Chile: UNESCO-OREALC.

López, L. E. (1988). Balance y perspectivas de la educación bilingüe en Puno. In L. E. López (Ed.), Pesquisas en Lingüística Andina (pp. 79-106). Lima-Puno: CONCYTEC/Universidad Nacional del Altiplano-Puno/GTZ.

López, L. E. (1989). La política lingüística peruana y la educación de la población indígena. In L. E. López & R. Moya (Eds.), Pueblos Indios, Estados, y Educación (pp. 133-166). Lima, Peru: PEB-Puno/PEBI (MEC-GTZ)/ERA.

López, L. E. (1991). La educación bilingüe en Puno: Hacia un ajuste de cuentas. In M. Zúñiga, I. Pozzi-Escot, & L. E. López (Eds.), Educación Bilingüe Intercultural: Reflexiones y Desafíos (pp. 173-217). Lima, Peru: Fomciencias.

López, L. E. (1995a). La Educación en Areas Indígenas de América Latina: Apreciaciones Comparativas desde la Educación Bilingüe Intercultural. Guatemala, Guatemala: Centro de Estudios de la Cultura Maya.

López, L. E. (1995b). Sigue el debate sobre educación bilingüe. Cuarto Intermedio, 36, 79-100.

López, L. E. (1996a). Donde el zapato aprieta: Tendencias y desafíos de la educación bilingüe en el Perú. Revista Andina, 14(2), 295-342.

López, L. E. (1996). To Guaranize: A verb actively conjugated by the Bolivian Guaranis. In N. H. Hornberger (Ed.), Indigenous Literacies in the Americas: Language Planning from the Bottom up (pp. 321-353). Berlin: Mouton.

López, L. E. (1997). Literacy and intercultural bilingual education in the Andes. Unpublished manuscript.

Luykx, A. (1996). From indios to profesionales: Stereotypes and student resistance in Bolivian teacher training. In B. Levinson, D. Foley, & D. Holland (Eds.), The Cultural

Production of the Educated Person: Critical Ethnographies of Schooling and Local Practice (pp. 239-272). Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Mannheim, B. (1984). Una nación acorralada: Southern Peruvian Quechua language planning and politics in historical perspective. Language in Society, 13(3), 291-309.

Martin-Jones, M. (forthcoming). Enterprising women: Multilingual literacies in the construction of new identities. In M. Martin-Jones & K. Jones (Eds.), Multilingual Literacies. Amsterdam: John Benjamins.

Moya, R. (1988). Educación bilingüe en el Ecuador: Retos y alternativas. In L. E. López (Ed.), Pesquisas en Lingüística Andina (pp. 367-386). Lima-Puno: CONCYTEC/Universidad Nacional del Altiplano-Puno/GTZ.

Moya, R. (1989). Políticas educativo-culturales y autogestión: El caso de Ecuador. In L. E. López & R. Moya (Eds.), Pueblos Indios, Estados, y Educación (pp. 107-132). Lima, Peru: PEB-Puno/PEBI (MEC-GTZ)/ERA.

Pennycook, A. (1994). Incommensurable discourses? Applied Linguistics, 15(2), 115-138.

Plaza, P., & Albó, X. (1989). Educación bilingüe y planificación lingüística en Bolivia. International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 77, 69-91.

Pozzi-Escot, I. (1981). La educación bilingüe en el marco legal de la reforma educativa peruana. In Acerca de la Historia y el Universo Aymara (pp. 113-123). Lima: CIED.

Pozzi-Escot, I. (1988). La educación bilingüe en el Perú: Una mirada retrospectiva y prospectiva. In L. E. López (Ed.), Pesquisas en Lingüística Andina (pp. 37-77). Lima-Puno: CONCYTEC/Universidad Nacional del Altiplano-Puno/GTZ.

Pozzi-Escot, I. (1989). Reflexiones para una política nacional de lenguas y culturas en la educación, con especial referencia a las lenguas vernáculas. In L. E. López, I. Pozzi-Escot, & M. Zúñiga (Eds.), Temas de Lingüística Aplicada (pp. 21-54). Lima: CONCYTEC/GTZ.

Pozzi-Escot, I. (1991). Ideas y planteamientos propuestos en el desarrollo y debate de la educación bilingüe en el país. In M. Zúñiga, I. Pozzi-Escot, & L. E. López (Eds.), Educación Bilingüe Intercultural: Reflexiones y Desafíos (pp. 121-147). Lima, Peru: Fomciencias.

Pozzi-Escot, I. (1993). Reflexiones sobre la política linguística peruana. Amazonía Peruana, 12(23), 15-36.

Rampton, M. B. H. (1992). Scope for empowerment in sociolinguistics? In D. Cameron, E. Frazer, P. Harvey, M. B. H. Rampton, & K. Richardson (Eds.), Researching Language: Issues of Power and Method (pp. 29-64). London: Routledge.

Rampton, B., Harris, R., & Leung, C. (1997). Multilingualism in England. Annual Review of Applied Linguistics, 17.

Ruiz, R. (1984). Orientations in language planning. NABE Journal, 8(2), 15-34.

Saville-Troike, M. (1989). The Ethnography of Communication: An Introduction. New York: Basil Blackwell.

Sawyer, C. (1997). Concluding reflections on the Cantor Seminar. Unpublished manuscript.

Smith, N. (1997). Multicultural practice and diversity education organizations: An examination of practices. Unpublished manuscript.

UNESCO/OREALC (1986). Proyecto Principal de Educación en América Latina y el Caribe. Boletín, 9(entire).

UNESCO/OREALC (1987). Taller Regional sobre Elaboración de Currículo Intercultural y Preparación de Material Didáctico para la Enseñanza de y en Lengua Materna: Informe Final. Santiago, Chile: Proyecto Principal de Educación en América Latina y el Caribe.

UNICEF/OREALC/UNESCO/AECI (1989). Normalización del Lenguaje Pedagógico para las Lenguas Andinas: Informe Final. La Paz, Bolivia:

Woolard, K. A., & Schieffelin, B. B. (1994). Language ideology. Annual Review of Anthropology, 23, 55-82.

Zúñiga, M., Ansion, J., & Cueva, L. (1987). Educación en Poblaciones Indígenas: Políticas y Estrategias en América Latina. Santiago, Chile: UNESCO/OREALC.

Appendix

Excerpts from bilingual education policies of Peru, Ecuador and Bolivia (bold numbering of sentences or phrases added for referencing purposes) ***('intercultural' and 'interculturalidad' italicized for referencing purposes)***

Política Nacional de Educación *Intercultural* y Educación Bilingüe *Intercultural* (Peru)

Fundamentación

1. El territorio del Perú está conformado por diversas zonas geográficas en las que confluyen diferentes grupos étnicos que tienen su propria lengua, su propia cultura, su propia historia. **2.** Todo ello define a la sociedad peruana como plural y heterogénea en lo cultural, étnico y lingüístico.

3. En una sociedad multiétnica, pluricultural y plurilingüe como la peruana, el Estado tiene el poder de permitirle a sus ciudadanos autoafirmarse social y culturalmente, a partir de los que son desde sus propios paradigmas y matrices socioculturales.

4. El proceso educativo, para contribuir al desarrollo integral de los educandos debe darse teniendo en cuenta la realidad socio-cultural y lingüística de éstos, asegurando la comunicación maestro-alumno, lo cual propiciaría el desarrollo y aprovechamiento de las potencialidades cognoscitivas y afectivas de los educandos.

5. El reto histórico de un país heterogéneo consiste en buscar unidad en la diversidad y, en ese sentido, consideramos que el sistema educativo peruano, debe formular un currículo diversificado y adaptado a la situación pluricultural y multilingüe.

6. La respuesta a la pluralidad socio-cultural y lingüística de parte del sistema educativo debe comenzar por asumir la *interculturalidad* entendida como el diálogo armónico entre culturas que, a partir de la propia matriz cultural, incorpora, selectiva y críticamente, elementos culturales provenientes de la cultura occidental y de las otras culturas coexistentes en el país.

7. La *interculturalidad* debe constituir el principio rector del sistema educativo y, como tal, darse en todos los niveles y modalidades, tengan éstos como vehículo educativo al castellano, una lengua ancestral o ambas; vale decir, la educación *intercultural* es una educación para todos los peruanos.

8. En aquellas situaciones en que los educandos tienen como lengua habitual un idioma distinto al castellano, el sistema educativo reconoce el derecho a estos pueblos a recibir una educación bilingüe; o sea, una educación en dos lenguas y en dos culturas. **9.** Esta educación deberá, además, proveer educación en la propia lengua y en castellano, ofrecer a los educandos la posibilidad de autoafirmarse como miembros de un grupo sociocultural concreto así como acceder al conocimiento de las reglas y patrones de la sociedad occidental y de las otras culturas del país. **10.** La educación nacional debe también aprovechar los aportes culturales de otras comunidades, ahora igualmente peruanas, como son la negra y la asiática.

11. Para cumplir con estos fines será necesario elaborar currículos diversificados que respondan a la pluralidad lingüístico cultural del país.

12. En este contexto, el castellano está destinado a ser lengua común de comunicación interétnica en el plano interno, a la vez que instrumento de comunicación internacional.

13. También consideramos necesario avanzar gradualmente hacia un mejor conocimiento y comprensión de las sociedades y culturas del Perú mediante un currículo para los alumnos hispanohablantes que incluya los elementos culturales y lingüísticos de nuestros pueblos nativos. **14.** De esta manera, los hispanohablantes mostrarían su voluntad democrática frente a sus pares de habla vernácula, y estos últimos sentirían que sus manifestaciones culturales y lingüísticas son dignas de repeto y que empieza a debilitarse la intolerancia cultural y lingüística que los obliga a guardar silencio y a esconder su condición de individuos diferentes. **15.** Sólo en un ambiente de mutua comprensión y de mutuo respeto y admiración será posible construir ese necesario diálogo interpares que contribuya al desrrollo armónico de la sociedad peruana.

16. De lo que se trata es de promover un cambio cualitativo en la educación peruana, que se enmarque dentro de un programa más ambicioso de comprensión de la heterogeneidad social, étnica, cultural y lingüística, que lleve al Perú a reconocerse a sí mismo, como un país pluricultural y multilingüe y al mismo tiempo unitario.

Lineamientos de política

17. 1. La *interculturalidad* deberá constituir el principio rector de todo el sistema educativo nacional. **18.** En tal sentido, la educación de todos los peruanos será intercultural.

19. 2. La *interculturalidad* propiciará al mismo tiempo el fortalecimiento de la propia identidad cultural, la autoestima, el respeto y la comprensión de culturas distintas. **20.** La adopción de la *interculturalidad* es esencial para el progreso social, económico y cultural tanto de las comunidades y regiones como del país en su totalidad.

21. 3. Para las poblaciones indígenas y campesinas, cuya lengua predominante sea vernácula, la educación será bilingüe además de intercultural.

22. 4. La Educación Bilingüe *Intercultural* (EBI) se fomentará en todos los niveles y modalidades del sistema educativo tanto escolarizados como no escolarizados, a fin de que se logre su implementación progresiva.

23. 5. Para las poblaciones hispanohablantes, el sistema educativo peruano incluirá contenidos referentes a las culturas y lenguas existentes en el país y, cuando sea posible, la enseñanza de alguna lengua vernácula.

Modelo de Educación *Intercultural* Bilingüe (Ecuador)

Política estatal con respecto a la educación *intercultural* bilingüe

1. En el proceso de educación intercultural, el Estado asume las siguientes responsabilidades:
2. -- garantizar la continuidad de la educación *intercultural* bilingüe para todas las culturas indígenas, independientemente del número de miembros que las integran, y para todos los niveles y modalidades del sistema educativo;
3. -- administrar, conjuntamente con las organizaciones indígenas, la dirección y gestión de todos los programas de educación *intercultural* bilingüe;
4. -- utilizar las lenguas de las culturas indígenas como lenguas principales de educación y el español como lengua de relación intercultural, en todos los niveles, subsistemas y modalidades;
5. -- desarrollar un programa que rescate y actualice la etnociencia de acuerdo con la teoría integrada de la ciencia y la cosmovisión que caracteriza a los pueblos indígenas;
6. -- garantizar la calidad de la educación *intercultural* bilingüe, así como la provisión de material educativo, incluyendo bibliotecas, videos, laboratorios, etc.;
7. -- formar educadores provenientes de las propias comunidades indígenas en base a los programas diseñados para el efecto, y garantizar su estabilidad y continuidad en la tarea educativa;
8. -- mantener las disposiciones legales y administrativas para el cumplimiento de los objetivos de la educación *intercultural* bilingüe;
9. -- asignar los fondos necesarios para la implementación y desarrollo de la educación intercultural, incluyendo gastos de investigación, producción de material didáctico, impresión, cursos de formación y remuneraciones del personal docente y administrativo;
10. -- garantizar, mediante acuerdos y tratados internacionales, la ejecución de programas binacionales tendientes a atender a las culturas indígenas separadas por fronteras territoriales.

Fines

11. Son fines de la Educación *Intercultural* Bilingüe los que se indican a continuación:
12. -- Apoyar el fortalecimiento de la *interculturalidad* de la sociedad ecuatoriana.
13. -- Fortalecer la identidad cultural y la organización de los pueblos indígenas.
14. -- Contribuir a la búsqueda de mejores condiciones de la calidad de vida de los pueblos indígenas.

Ley de Reforma Educativa (Bolivia)

Título Uno, Capitulo Unico. Bases y fines de la educación boliviana

1. Artículo 1. Para la transformación constante del Sistema Educativo Nacional, en función de los intereses del país como un proceso planificado, contínuo y de largo alcance, la educación boliviana se estructura sobre las siguientes bases fundamentales:

2. 1. Es la más alta función del Estado, porque es un derecho del pueblo e instrumento de liberación nacional y porque tiene la obligación de sostenerla, dirigirla y controlarla, a través de un vasto sistema escolar.

3. 2. Es universal, gratuita en todos los establecimientos fiscales y obligatoria en el nivel primario, porque contiene postulados democráticos básicos y porque todo boliviano tiene derecho a igualdad de oportunidades.

4. 3. Es democrática, porque la sociedad participa activamente en su planificación, organización, ejecución y evaluación, para que responda a sus intereses, necesidades, desafíos y aspiraciones.

5. 4. Es nacional, porque responde funcionalmente a las exigencias vitales del país en sus diversas regiones geográfico-culturales, buscando la integración y la solidaridad de sus pobladores para la formación de la conciencia nacional a través de un destino histórico común.

6. 5. Es *intercultural* y bilingüe, porque asume la heterogeneidad socio-cultural del país en un ambiente de respeto entre todos los bolivianos, hombres y mujeres.

7. 6. Es derecho y deber de todoboliviano, porque se organiza y desarrolla con la participación de toda la sociedad sin restricciones ni discriminaciones de etnia, de cultura, de región, de condición social, física, mental, sensorial, de género, de credo o de edad.

8. 7. Es revolucionaria, porque encierra un nuevo contenido doctrinal de proyección histórica que tiende a transformar la orientación espiritual del pueblo y de la futuras generaciones.

9. 8. Es integral, coeducativa, activa, progresista y científica, porque responde a las necesidades de aprendizaje de los educandos, y porque de esa manera atiende a las necesidades locales, regionales y nacionales del desarrollo integral.

10. 9. Es promotora de la justicia, la solidaridad y la equidad sociales, porque incentiva la autonomía, la creatividad, el sentido de responsabilidad y el espíritu crítico de los educandos, hombres y mujeres.

11. 10. Es indispensable para el desarrollo del país y para la profundización de la democracia, porque asume la interdependencia de la teoría y de la práctica, junto con el trabajo manual e intelectual, en un proceso de permanente autocrítica y renovación de contenidos y métodos.

12. 11. Es el fundamento de la integración nacional y de la participación de Bolivia en la comunidad regional y mundial de naciones, partiendo de la afirmación de nuestra soberanía e identidad.

Título Dos, Capítulo Uno. De los objetivos del sistema educativo.

13. Artículo 3. Son objetivos y políticas del Sistema Educativo Nacional:

14. 1. Garantizar la sólida y permanente formación de nuestros Recursos Humanos, a través de instrumentos dinámicos, para situar a la Educación Boliviana a la altura de las exigencias de los procesos de cambio del país y del mundo.

15. 2. Organizar un Sistema Educativo Nacional capaz de renovarse y de mejorar su calidad permanentemente para satisfacer las cambiantes necesidades de aprendizaje y de desarrollo nacional, así como para incorporar las innovaciones tecnológicas y científicas; creando instrumentos de control, seguimiento y evaluación, con especial énfasis en la medición de la calidad, instrumentos de información y de investigación educativas.

16. 3. Mejorar la calidad y la eficiencia de la Educación; haciéndola pertinente a las necesidades de la comunidad y ampliándola en su cobertura y en la permanencia de los educandos en el sistema educativo y garantizando la igualdad de los derechos de hombres y mujeres.

17. 4. Organizar el conjunto de las actividades educativas ofreciendo múltiples y complementarias opciones que permitan al educando aprender por sí mismo, en un proceso de permanente autosuperación.

18. 5. Construir un sistema educativo *intercultural* y participativo que posibilite el acceso de todos los bolivianos a la educación, sin discriminación alguna.

19. 6. Lograr la democratización de los servicios educativos a partir de la plena cobertura en el nivel primario, hacia la ampliación significativa de la cobertura en la educación secundaria, desarrollando acciones que promuevan la igualdad de acceso, oportunidades y logros educativos, dando atención preferencial a la mujer y a los sectores menos favorecidos y valorando la función decisiva que, en tal sentido, desempeña la educación fiscal.

20. 7. Promover el interés por los trabajos manuales, creativos y productivos en los niños y jóvenes, facilitando su profesionalización en todas las especialidades requeridas por el desarrollo nacional.

21. 8. Apoyar la transformación institucional y curricular de la educación superior.